

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5935

Title: Specific metabolic biomarkers as prognostic factors in colorectal cancer

Reviewer code: 00000774

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-30 11:35

Date reviewed: 2013-10-02 14:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a sprawling review describing correlation of metabolic factors including dyslipidemia, adipokines, and constituents of the IGF family, with colorectal carcinogenesis. The review is extensive and comprehensive. There are several minor points to be addressed. 1) The title should be modified. This review covers not only "prognostic factors" but a variety of risk for CRC (occurrence, development, etc). 2) Page 7, line 10: "relative risk 117" may be incorrect. 3) Page 12, line 2: The sentence "Hypoadiponectinaemia is inversely linked...." is not consistent with the subsequent paragraph. 4) Page 12, line 18: The parentheses are blank. 5) Page 13, line 1: AND is incorrect. 6) Page 14, line 15: The meaning of the sentence "The serum concentrations of leptin...." is uncertain. 7) Page 16, line 18: ", and, and by" is incorrect. 8) Page 17, line 26: HbA1C is mistyped. 9) Page 19, line 12: The sentence "The same data obtained...and right and colon cancer." does not make sense. 10) Page 20, line 4; The sentence "....in colorectal patients." misses "cancer". 11) Page 21, line 8; The sentence "The metabolic pathways of cancer cells...." is not suitable for the summary of this paragraph. 12) Because this review encompasses a lot of aspects regarding metabolic factors and risk of CRC, the core of the conclusions should be shown by figures. 13) The figure 1 should be depicted more minutely. The abbreviations in the figure should be determined in the legend.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5935

Title: Specific metabolic biomarkers as prognostic factors in colorectal cancer

Reviewer code: 00008369

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-30 11:35

Date reviewed: 2013-10-05 09:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) The author should improve the abstract, in English writing, more persuasive and attractive, and contain the core point of current review article. 2) Instruction should be reorganized into more core-writing fashion than current duffse writing. 3) Main contents should be "state of art" description. Current is too much comsumptive in contents, leading to core points relevant to authors' aim for biomarker potential of colon cancer. 4) Conclusion should be described based onto author's sentence, not through referenced statements.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5935

Title: Specific metabolic biomarkers as prognostic factors in colorectal cancer

Reviewer code: 00253956

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-30 11:35

Date reviewed: 2013-12-13 22:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review article entitled “specific metabolic biomarkers as risk and prognostic factors in colorectal cancer” by Muc-Wierzgon et al 2013 provides a detailed insight into studies that consider the usefulness of several colorectal cancer (CRC) biomarkers. The authors have approached a review of this nature in a systematic manner, providing background to the marker and then detailing and evaluating studies that have utilised the biomarker in CRC studies. The review is interesting and enlightening, and will likely prove a valuable source of reference for scientists working in the CRC field. I would therefore recommend publication, with a request to check the manuscript for typos and formatting errors that are most notable in the reference section.